REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 3, 2006. Claims 1-13 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 12 and 13 are in independent form. Claims 1, 2, 6, 9 ,12 and 13 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The disclosure was objected to because of the informalities noted in paragraph 1 of the Office Action. The disclosure has been carefully reviewed and amended as deemed necessary with special attention to the points raised in paragraph 1 of the Office Action. It is believed that the objection to the disclosure has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The claims have been carefully reviewed and amended as deemed necessary to ensure that they conform fully to the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph, with special attention to the points raised in paragraphs 2-3 of the Office Action. It is believed that the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph, has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Application Publication No. 2004/0019671 (Metz).

As shown above, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 12 and 13 in terms that more clearly define what he regards as his invention. Applicant submits that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a network device managing apparatus including: (1) first receiving means for receiving a request and identification information from a data processing apparatus; (2) first list forming means for forming a list of the network devices according to the request received by the first receiving means; (3) holding means for holding the identification information received by said first receiving means and the list formed by the first list forming means in association with each other; (4) second receiving means for receiving a request and the identification information from the data processing apparatus, after the list formed by the first list forming means was held by the holding means; (5) second list forming means for forming a list of the network devices according to the request received by the second receiving means; (6) acquiring means for acquiring, from the lists held by the holding means, the list formed by the first list forming means associated with the identification information received by the second receiving means; (7) comparing means for comparing the list acquired by the acquiring means with the list formed by the second list forming means; (8) data forming means for forming data based on the list formed by the second list forming means, and specifying the network devices not included in the list acquired by the acquiring means, such specification being used to display the list on which the specified network devices are emphasized; and (9) data transmitting means for transmitting the data formed by the data forming means to the data processing apparatus.

Among other notable features of Claim 1 are: (1) comparing means for comparing the list acquired by the acquiring means with the list formed by the second list forming means and (2) data forming means for forming data based on the list formed by the second list forming means, and specifying the network devices not included in the list acquired by the acquiring means, such specification being used to display the list on which the specified network

14

devices are emphasized. By virtue of the structure recited in Claim 1, a list can be displayed with respect to each user of network devices with newly added devices being emphasized.

Metz relates to a network managing device that periodically performs printer discovery, thus acquiring printer information such as an IP address and the like, and registers the printer information on a main list. Then, the printers registered on the main list are automatically distributed to a filtered second list according to criteria such as specific model types, locations, capabilities, and the like. Metz discusses that the network managing device performs the printer discovery and forms two kinds of lists, but does not disclose that the two kinds of lists are compared and the data for emphasizing a difference therebetween is formed. In other words, Metz is silent about the technique of comparing new and old lists of network devices and extracting a newly found device. Thus, Applicant has found nothing in Metz that would teach or suggest at least "comparing means for comparing the list acquired by said acquiring means with the list formed by said second list forming means" or "data forming means for forming data based on the list formed by said second list forming means, and specifying the network devices not included in the list acquired by said acquiring means, such specification being used to display the list on which the specified network devices are emphasized," as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Metz.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 1.

Independent Claims 6 and 12 are method and program claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable over Metz for at least the

15

same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

Claim 2 is directed to a network device managing apparatus which includes: (1) first receiving means for receiving a request and identification information from a data processing apparatus; (2) first list forming means for forming a list showing respective states of network devices according to the request received by the first receiving means; (3) holding means for holding the identification information received by the first receiving means and the list formed by the first list forming means in association with each other; (4) second receiving means for receiving a request and the identification information from the data processing apparatus, after the list formed by the first list forming means was held by the holding means; (5) second list forming means for forming a list of the respective states of the network devices according to the request received by the second receiving means; (6) acquiring means for acquiring, from the lists held by the holding means, the list formed by the first list forming means associated with the identification information received by the second receiving means; (7) comparing means for comparing the list acquired by the acquiring means with the list formed by the second list forming means; (8) data forming means for forming data which specifies the network devices whose states have changed and which is used to display the list on which the specified network devices are emphasized; and (9) data transmitting means for transmitting the data formed by the data forming means to the data processing apparatus.

For substantially the same reasons as discussed above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant has found nothing in Metz that would teach or suggest at least "comparing means for comparing the list acquired by said acquiring means with the list formed by said second list forming means" or "data forming means for forming data which specifies the network devices

16

whose states have changed and which is used to display the list on which the specified network devices are emphasized," as recited in Claim 2.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 2 is not anticipated by Metz.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 2.

Independent Claims 9 and 13 are method and program claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 2, and are believed to be patentable over Metz for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 2.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

<div align="right">

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer A. Reda/
Jennifer A. Reda
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 57,840

</div>

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 601304v1